

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claim 20 is currently pending in the application and stands rejected. Claims 1-19 and 21-40 were previously cancelled. Claim 20 is amended as above. New claims 41-56 are added. The drawings are amended and replacement sheets submitted herewith. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Based upon the amendments above and the arguments that follow, the Applicants submit all claims are now in condition for allowance.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the view numbers were not larger than the reference numerals. In response, the Applicant submits herewith replacement drawings in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(u)(2) and 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d). The Applicants respectfully submit the objections are overcome and request the objections be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Claim 20 is amended as above to distinctly point out the invention. Support for the amendment can be found in specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added to the claim by way of this amendment. The Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,764,313 (hereinafter "Cameron") under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 20 as amended recites:

A buoyant foundation comprising a foundation body with blocked thrust having an upper part of the foundation adapted to support a load and wherein the foundation body is adapted to be submerged below a wave motion area of water.

Cameron does not disclose the presently claimed invention. The flotation platform disclosed by Cameron floats on the surface of the water, and is not adapted to be submerged below a wave motion area of water as claimed by the Applicants. The present invention is not a floating platform as taught by Cameron, but a buoyant platform adapted to be submerged having blocked vertical thrust. The platform of the present invention is placed well below the wave motion area and thus avoids the tilting caused by wave motion. The present invention works on a totally different principle compared to a floating platform, which sits on the water surface due to its buoyancy and is immersed in the water only as far as its own weight creates a displacement of water enough to carry the platform on the water, as a ship.

This fundamental concept is totally missing in Cameron, which could in no way support a load that would not be impacted by the tilting movements created by the wave loads. Cameron does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the Applicant's invention as claimed. Therefore, claim 20 is allowable and not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant submits that all claims pending in the patent application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy X. Gibson/
Timothy X. Gibson Reg. # 40,618
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP
900 Route 9 North
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Phone: (732) 634-7634
Fax: (732) 634-6887